REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 2, 6 and 8-

11. Claims 2 and 6 have been amended. Claims 9-11 have been added. Claims

1, 4-5 and 7 have been cancelled, without prejudice. The instant specification

has been amended. The drawings have been amended. No new matter has

been added as a result of these amendments.

SPECIFICATION

The instant specification has been amended to describe two flowcharts

(Fig. 5 and Fig. 6) that have been added to the drawings. The brief description

of the drawings has been amended to reference new Figure 5 and new Figure

6. No new matter has been added.

DRAWINGS

Figure 5, which illustrates a process of translating instructions in

accordance with an embodiment of the present invention, has been added to

the drawings. Figure 6, which illustrates a process of translating

instructions in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention, has

been added to the drawings. No new matter has been added.

ALLOWED CLAIM

Claim 8 is allowed by the Examiner. The Applicants thanks the

Examiner for indicating this allowed subject matter.

Serial No. 09/417,980

Examiner: Ellis, Richard L.

Art Unit 2183 TRAN-P012

- 10 -

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 2 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but indicated as allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of the

base claim. The Applicants thanks the Examiner for indicating this allowable

subject matter.

Claim 2 has been re-written in independent form, including all

limitations from Claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request allowance

of Independent Claim 2.

Currently Amended Independent Claim 6 recites in part:

releasing a lock for any sequence of host instructions running in a locked condition immediately after committing state of the target

processor and storing memory stores generated by previously-

executed translation sequences.

Claim 6 has been amended, but does <u>not</u> include all limitations from its base

claim, Claim 5. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 6 as

amended is patentable in that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the above

claim limitations. As such, Applicants respectfully request allowance of

Currently Amended Independent Claim 6.

Serial No. 09/417,980

Art Unit 2183 TRAN-P012 Examiner: Ellis, Richard L. - 11 -

## <u>OBJECTIONS</u>

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Applicants have submitted new drawings herewith illustrating steps in Claims. Applicants respectfully request removal of the objection to the drawings.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

# 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1, written description and enablement. The rejections are most in light of the cancellation to Claim 7, without prejudice.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. The rejection to Claim 5 is most in light of the cancellation of Claim 5, without prejudice.

Claim 6 has been amended. Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 6 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2.

## 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Robinson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,307,504 (hereinafter, Robinson). This rejection to Claims 1, 4 and 7 is most in light of the cancellation of these claims, without prejudice.

Serial No. 09/417,980 Examiner: Ellis, Richard L. Art Unit 2183 TRAN-P012 Claims 1, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kelly et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,958,061 (hereinafter, Kelly). The rejection to Claims 1, 4 and 7 is most in light of the cancellation of these claims, without prejudice.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sites et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,428,786 (hereinafter, Sites). The rejection to Claim 7 is most in light of the cancellation of Claim 7, without prejudice.

## NEW CLAIMS

Claims 9-11 have been added. Support for new Claims 9-11 may be found in the instant specification at least at page 13, lines 1 - 13. No new matter has been added as a result of the additional claims. Claims 9-11 depend from Claims 2, 6, and 8 respectively and are respectfully believed to derive patentability at least therefrom.

Serial No. 09/417,980 Examiner: Ellis, Richard L.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2, 6 and 8-11 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 2, 6 and 8-11 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated:  $\frac{9}{24}$ , 2004

Ronald M. Pomerenke Registration No. 43,009

Address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, California 95113

Telephone:

(408) 938-9060 Voice

(408) 938-9069 FAX

# AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached two (2) sheets of drawings are new Figure 5 and new Figure 6.

Attachment: Two (2) New Drawing Sheets